DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 185 913 HE 012 593

AUTHOR Franklin, Paul
TITLE Beyond Student Financial Aid. Issues and Options for Strengthening Support Service Programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act.
INSTITUTION College Entrance Examination Board, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE Apr 80
NOTE 58p.
AVAILABLE FROM College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, NJ 08541 ($3.00).

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS *Access to Education; Adult Students; Ancillary School Services; College Bound Students; *Compensatory Education; Cooperative Programs; Coordination; Counseling Services; Educational Finance; *Educationally Disadvantaged; Efficiency; Eligibility; Enrollment Trends; *Equal Education; Federal Aid; Federal Legislation; *Federal Programs; Government Role; Higher Education; Low Income Groups; Public Policy; Student Financial Aid; Student Motivation; Tutorial Programs
IDENTIFIERS Educational Information Centers; Educational Opportunity Centers; *Higher Education Act Title IV; Special Services for Disadvantaged Students; Talent Search; Upward Bound

ABSTRACT

Current practices and future directions are examined for the federal student support service programs known as TRIO (Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, and Educational Opportunity Centers) and the Educational Information Centers program. The TRIO programs identify low income and educationally disadvantaged students, motivate and counsel them in their pursuit of secondary educational alternatives, and provide guidance, tutorial, and other services following college entry. Educational Information Centers have a broader mandate to serve all students who need information, counseling, and referral services. It is felt that these programs are a crucial element of national policy to equalize opportunity, and have been neglected. Trends in college enrollment and populations, in student aid availability, and in adult learning underline the growing importance of these programs. This report assesses issues and options in these Title IV programs: authorization level for the various programs; possible overlap and duplication among the programs; possible need to specify stronger integration or coordination among these or other programs for the disadvantaged; and groups to be served. Recommendations related to these issues are made for each program. Appended are two tables: (1) total program authorization and appropriations from 1965 through 1979; and (2) a history of TRIO allocation levels by program from 1966 through 1979. (MSE)

ED185913

Beyond Student Financial Aid

Issues and Options for Strengthening Support Service Programs under Title IV of the Higher Education Act

Paul Franklin

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

CEEB

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH EDUCATION & WELFARE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

HE 012 593

April 1980

A Special Report
from the Washington Office of the
College Board

The College Board is a nonprofit membership organization that provides tests and other educational services for students, schools, and colleges. The membership is composed of more than 2,500 colleges, schools, school systems, and education associations. Representatives of the members serve on the Board of Trustees and advisory councils and committees that consider the programs of the College Board and participate in the determination of its policies and activities.

The Washington Office of the College Board conducts research relevant to public issues in education, with emphasis on the financing of postsecondary education. The office is located at 1717 Massachusetts Avenue, N.W., Washington, D.C.

Additional copies of this report may be obtained from College Board Publication Orders, Box 2815, Princeton, New Jersey 08541. Please send $3.00 to cover the costs of postage and handling.

Copyright © 1980 by College Entrance Examination Board. All rights reserved.

Printed in the United States of America.

Contents

Acknowledgments v

Executive Summary vii

I. Introduction 1

II. The Continued Importance of Title IV Support Service Programs 4

III. Overarching Issues and Options 11

A. What Should be the Authorization Level for the TRIO Programs? . . 11

B. Is There Overlap and Duplication among Title IV Support Service Programs that Should be Eliminated? 14

C. Should Stronger Integration of and/or Coordination among the Programs be Specified? Among Other Programs Targeted on the Disadvantaged? 18

D. Is There a Need to Specify Further and/or Alter the Participant Eligibility Requirements for the TRIO Programs? Who Should be Served? 20

IV. Issues and Options by Program 27

A. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students 27

B. Service Learning Centers 32

C. Upward Bound 32

D. Talent Search 36

E. Educational Opportunity Centers 38

F. Educational Information Centers 40

Appendix:

History of TRIO Funding Authorization and Appropriation Levels . . . 46

Table 1. Total Program Authorization and Appropriations 46

Table 2. History of TRIO Allocation Levels by Program 47

Staff of the Washington Office

Lois D. Rice, Vice President of the College Board
Lawrence E. Gladieux, Director of the Washington Office
Charles R. Byce, Policy Research Associate
Pamela H. Christoffel, Research and Development Associate
Martin A. Corry, Assistant for Lifelong Learning
Janet S. Hansen, Policy Research Associate
Mary H. Budd, Office Manager
Diane C. Erving, Secretary/Receptionist
Julia M. Gordon, Secretary
Dorothea C. McFarland, Secretary

Washington Office Advisory Panel

Richard J. Ramsden, Vice President for Administration and Finance
Brown University
Gregory R. Anrig, Commissioner of Education
Commonwealth of Massachusetts
Cándido Antonio de León, Professor (on leave)
City University of New York
William M. Geer, Director of Student Aid
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Margaret S. Gordon, Associate Director
Carnegie Council on Higher Education
Robert P. Huff, Director of Financial Aids
Stanford University
Donald M. Stewart, President
Spelman College

Acknowledgments

The Washington Office of the College Board conducts research on policy issues in education, with an emphasis on postsecondary education, finance, and the evaluation of programs designed to broaden access and choice in higher education. Legislative and policy analyses are shared with College Board members, state and federal policymakers, and other researchers.

This report examines policy options for the information, counseling, referral, and retention services under Title IV of the Higher Education Act. The Washington Office gratefully acknowledges financial support for this study from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Paul Franklin, a consultant to the Washington Office, prepared the report with guidance and assistance from Lawrence Gladieux, Pamela Christoffel, and Martin Corry. Many other individuals took part in the effort. Advice and comments were provided by Fuji Adachi, Division of Student Educational Opportunity, University of Wyoming; Kathy Felker, Director of Special Services Programs, University of Utah; Peter Fellenz, Director, Massachusetts Educational Opportunity Centers; David Johnson, Director, Division of Student Services, United States Office of Education; Don MacKenzie, Special Services Program, Marquette University; Arnold Mitchem, Convenor, National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, Marquette University; Paulette Morgan, Director, Educational Opportunity Center, Washington, D.C.; and, Monte Perez, Office of the Assistant Secretary for Education, Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

The work presented herein does not necessarily reflect a policy or position of the College Board, nor any endorsement by the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.

Executive Summary

Too long the neglected stepchild of student financial aid, the student support service programs authorized under Title IV of the Higher Education Act are a crucial element of national policy designed to equalize opportunity for postsecondary education. This paper examines current practices and explores future directions for the federal programs known as "TRIO"--Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, and Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC)--as well as the more recent Educational Information Centers (EIC) program.

The TRIO programs identify low income and educationally disadvantaged students, motivate and counsel them in their pursuit of postsecondary alternatives, and, following college entry, provide guidance, tutorial, and other services to improve these students' chances of receiving degrees. Educational Information Centers have a broader mandate to serve all students who need information, counseling, and referral services.

Research demonstrates that financial aid is not enough to equalize opportunity for postsecondary access and choice. Despite an ever-growing federal and state commitment to monetary assistance, low-income students are enrolled in postsecondary education at almost the same level as they were in 1968. If one is poor or from a racial minority, one's chances of entry and successful completion of postsecondary education are still unequal to that of the rest of society. Program evaluations and experience indicate that student support services are critical to correcting these inequities. Yet TRIO program appropriations have been sufficient in recent years to serve only about 6 percent of the eligible population in need of such services.

Three expected trends of the 1980s underline the growing importance of the TRIO and EIC programs.

- An increasing proportion of traditional-aged college students will be nonwhite, requiring continued if not accelerated support service programs, particularly academic support programs.
- The recent extension of student financial aid to middle-income students will require better and improved delivery of information about aid opportunities.
- Adults, who according to surveys especially need information and counseling

services, will continue to constitute a significant if not increasing proportion of those pursuing postsecondary education.

Through the impending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act--and the subsequent rewriting of regulations--legislators and program administrators have an opportunity to make the Title IV support service programs serve current and new populations of students more effectively.

Chapter I of this report documents briefly the legislative history of the support service programs.

Chapter II discusses the importance of these programs in the nation's efforts to equalize educational opportunity.

Chapter III assesses issues and options that span the Title IV support service programs. The most important of these are:

- *What should be the authorization level for TRIO programs?*

The Fiscal Year 1979 authorization for TRIO programs is $200 million. Actual appropriations are $140 million. This disparity between authorization and appropriation levels has been the pattern historically.

The case for increasing both the authorization and appropriation levels is persuasive. Two options might be considered:

1. Raise the authorization from $200 million to $400 million, phased in over time.

2. Tie TRIO funding to appropriations for the Basic Educational Opportunity Grant program (or BEOG plus federal campus-based programs).

The latter alternative offers both a rationale and a mechanism for adjusting TRIO appropriations from year to year, and reflects the conceptual and practical linkage between financial aid and support service programs in equalizing educational opportunity.

- *Is there overlap and duplication among Title IV support service programs that should be eliminated?*

The Educational Opportunity Centers and Talent Search programs are frequently cited as having overlapping statutory authority. However, there is little if any duplication of service occurring in actual practice. In fact, there is evidence that EOCs and Talent Search projects coordinate their services when they exist contiguously. Thus, one reasonable option for dealing with overlap in the statutory authorities of EOC and Talent Search is to do nothing. Other options are provided in the full report.

The Service Learning Center and Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

programs constitute the other potential area of overlap. Since the Service Learning Center program is not operational, a strong argument can be made for eliminating it from the statute.

- *Should the statute specify stronger integration of and/or coordination among the Title IV programs or among other programs targeted on the disadvantaged?*

There are several possibilities for strengthening coordination and, simultaneously, reducing the prospect of duplication in service. Among them are strengthening the relationships of Educational Information Centers with Talent Search and Educational Opportunity Centers and the relationship between TRIO programs and activities funded by the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act. Coordination between TRIO and student financial aid programs could be enhanced by earmarking a percentage of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) funds for allocation to Talent Search, EOC, and Upward Bound projects for their direct award to TRIO participants.

- *Who should be served? Is there a need to specify further and/or alter eligibility requirements for the TRIO programs?*

Through the years, TRIO programs have been targeted on educationally and economically disadvantaged youth. While these emphases are well understood, statutory and regulatory definitions of program target populations suffer from conflict and inconsistency.

There are several options that would make participant eligibility requirements simpler, more consistent and explicable. Among them are:

1. Maintain the current programs but target them consistently on "first generation" college students who also meet revised low-income criteria. This alternative would make participant eligibility more consistent and explicable among the programs but might be difficult to administer.

2. Continue the historical emphasis on serving those from low-income families using current--or revised--income criteria, eliminate ambiguous language, and modify the current age criteria.

Chapter IV assesses issues and options on a program-by-program basis and suggests modifications in statute and regulations. The effect of modifying participant eligibility requirements, as outlined in Chapter III is detailed for each TRIO program. Moreover, Chapter IV outlines a set of program services for each program and suggests that they, or some alternative, be included to

illustrate the kinds of services to be provided by each program.

Chapter IV continues with a series of program-by-program recommendations:

Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Program

- Limit eligibility to institutions that offer at least a baccalaureate degree or at least two years of work toward a baccalaureate.
- Extend Special Services programs to include graduate institutions, facilitating the funding of projects to assist disadvantaged students through graduate programs, particularly in professional and technical areas where minority group members are severely underrepresented.
- Require that sponsoring institutions meet the full financial need for Special Services students.
- Require some financial match on the part of sponsoring institutions to demonstrate their commitment to serving the needs of disadvantaged students.

Service Learning Centers

- Inasmuch as the program has never been funded and is strikingly similar to the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program, a strong case can be made for its elimination.

Upward Bound

- Include an emphasis on programs that prepare participants for careers in which persons from disadvantaged backgrounds are particularly underrepresented.

Talent Search

- Permit projects to provide tutorial services to precollege students when such services are not otherwise available.

Educational Opportunity Centers

- Allow EOCs to provide academic support services to all clients when such services are not otherwise available. Such services are currently limited to students already enrolled in postsecondary education.

Educational Information Centers

- Change the name of the authority to the Educational and Career Services program to reflect the breadth and scope of services more adequately.
- Modify the current statute and regulations to stress the role of EICs in coordinating and encouraging a statewide network of services. Several options for achieving this modification are provided.
- Increase the program's appropriation so that states can implement the program more effectively.
- Amend the Vocational Education Act and Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to make the EIC director a statutory member of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee.

I. Introduction

For many years equal access to educational opportunity for all citizens has been a guiding principle of the nation's educational policy. Born of the civil rights movement of the early 1960s and President Johnson's "War on Poverty," the philosophic underpinning of the concept is that education provides the best hope for breaking the cycle of poverty, particularly for the nation's racial minorities.

The landmark Higher Education Act of 1965 brought substance to the concept of equal access by including the first major programmatic initiatives to extend the benefits of a college education to low-income students. Title IV of the act included a student assistance provision which, for the first time, authorized "Educational Opportunity Grants" for exceptionally needy students, as well as an interim program of federally guaranteed student loans, assistance to states to establish guaranteed loan programs, and a college work-study program (transferred from the "War on Poverty" legislation of the previous year).

Included with the authority for Educational Opportunity Grants was a relatively obscure provision authorizing "Contracts to Encourage Full Utilization of Educational Talent Search." Known as Talent Search, this provision was to support projects that would seek out those needy students eligible for the newly authorized Educational Opportunity Grant program, encourage them to take advantage of the grants and pursue a postsecondary education. Funded for the first time in Fiscal Year 1966 at $2 million, Educational Talent Search was the first programmatic recognition[1] that opening the doors to education and providing the financial wherewithal for low-income students to enter was not enough--outreach and counseling services were also needed to help equalize access.

The Higher Education Amendments of 1968 gave further substance to this commitment by transferring Upward Bound programs from the Office of Economic Opportunity to the Office of Education; adding a new program authority entitled "Special Services for Disadvantaged Students"; and authorizing increased

1. It should be noted that Upward Bound pilot projects were initiated in the summer of 1965 with Carnegie Corporation support and research and demonstration funds from the Office of Economic Opportunity.

funcing for subsequent years under the act. This linkage of the three special programs for the disadvantaged was not by accident as they were conceived to form an integrated, comprehensive program to identify low-income and educationally disadvantaged students, motivate them to pursue postsecondary education, and, once they had entered, provide remedial, counseling, and other services to increase the likelihood that they would stay. Hence, the concept of equal opportunity was broadened to encompass not only financial aid and recruitment but also services to enhance the academic achievement of students after enrollment.

The Education Amendments of 1972 added Educational Opportunity Centers (EOC) to the three support service programs which by then had become known as the TRIO programs.[2] The EOC authority was designed to provide a broad range of preenrollment and academic support services to all residents of a community or geographic area with a large concentration of low-income people.

The 1976 Education Amendments included two new program authorities: Service Learning Centers which were added to the subpart of Title IV that continued the TRIO programs; and a new subpart 5 entitled "Education Information," which authorized states to establish centers to help insure the availability of educational and career information, guidance, counseling, and referral services to all citizens.

Thus, today, some 15 years after the beginning of Talent Search, there are five support service programs authorized and targeted to prospective and currently enrolled low-income and disadvantaged students, plus Educational Information Centers aimed at providing broad preenrollment services to all citizens who are considering a postsecondary education. The funding authorization for TRIO programs is currently $200 million, with the EIC initiative authorized at $40 million. However, the actual appropriations for the programs have never attained authorization levels, resulting in highly inadequate and uneven availability of services to those eligible.[3] By most estimates, only 6 percent of the population eligible for TRIO programs was served between 1973 and 1977

2. All programs, under subpart 4, part A of Title IV, including Educational Opportunity Centers, are still commonly referred to as the TRIO programs.
3. See appendix for an historical summary of TRIO program authorization and appropriation levels.

when appropriations were frozen at $70.3 million.[4]

Even at the significantly higher Fiscal Year 1979 appropriation of $140 million for TRIO programs, it is anticipated that less than 10 percent of those eligible will be served. And the Educational Information Center FY 79 appropriation of $3 million provides participating states with only a token amount to help strengthen statewide networks of information, counseling, and referral services.

Hence, while the number and array of programs aimed at equalizing educational opportunity are impressive, the financial commitment has not been sufficient for the programs to meet their objectives. Yet, research continues persistently and disturbingly to demonstrate that if one is poor or from a minority group, one's chances of successful entry and completion of a postsecondary education are unequal compared to those of the rest of society.[5] While systematic evaluation of special support service programs is uneven, it is generally recognized that the services they provide are critical to helping low-income and disadvantaged students ease through the doors of postsecondary institutions and in helping to increase the likelihood that they will stay once they have entered.

As the 96th Congress deliberates over reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and the Office of Education subsequently issues new program regulations, it seems clear that the biggest issue will be what changes can be made to bring real and lasting educational opportunity to all citizens. It is within this context that this report looks at past and current practices as well as future needs and directions for the Talent Search, Upward Bound, Special Services for Disadvantaged Students, Educational Opportunity Center, Service Learning Center and Educational Information Center programs.

---

4. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, *Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the United States Office of Education*, Fiscal Year 1977. (Washington, D.C.: Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, OE, USDHEW).

5. Mary A. Golladay and Jay Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition. (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1978).

II. The Continued Importance of Title IV Support Service Programs

The need for information and counseling services regarding educational and student financial aid opportunities is dramatic for low-income people, racial minorities, and otherwise disadvantaged populations. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) reports that while 81.2 percent of the 1975 high school seniors with family incomes of $25,000 or over planned to attend college, only 37 percent of the seniors with family incomes below $5,000 had similar plans. Furthermore, those with family incomes between $5,000 and $7,999 were even less inclined to pursue a postsecondary education than were those with family incomes below $5,000 (31.5 percent).[6]

Actual enrollments also reveal disparities when students are compared by income. In 1976, for example, only 22.4 percent of those 18 to 24 year olds with family incomes below $5,000 were enrolled while 58.2 percent of those from families with incomes $15,000 and over were attending postsecondary education.[7] Despite efforts at equalizing opportunity in the past decade, the rate of enrollment for those from families with incomes below $5,000 is almost exactly the same as in 1968.[8]

Even if low-income students find their way into a postsecondary institution, their chances of completing a program are disproportionately low when compared to middle- and upper-income students. A special College Board panel on financing low-income and minority students in higher education found, for example, that a student from a family in the bottom income quartile has less than one-third the chance of a student in the top quartile of completing a college program.[9]

Furthermore, despite the effort to bring nonwhite populations into postsecondary education, racial minorities still lag behind their white counterparts in postsecondary education enrollments. Recent census data indicate

---

6. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, p. 108.
7. United States Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P-20, No. 319, "School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1976." (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1978), p. 5.
8. Ibid.
9. The College Board, *Toward Equal Educational Opportunity for Higher Education*, Report of the Panel on Financing Low-Income and Minority Students in Higher Education. (New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1973), p. 15.

that minority student enrollments have not only leveled off after the gains made in the early 1970s, but may actually have begun to decline. Additionally, evidence continues to indicate that blacks and other minorities have attrition rates considerably higher than white students, particularly in traditionally white institutions.[10] And only an estimated 6 percent of the baccalaureate degrees conferred in 1978 were received by minority students--yet another indication that promoting equal access to educational opportunity does not, in fact, guarantee equal opportunity.[11]

Limited English speaking ability, inferior secondary education, physical handicaps, and severe rural isolation are other factors that, alone or coupled with low-income and racial minority status, militate against equal educational opportunity.

Beyond those barriers, the educational attainment of the family head can also be viewed as a measure of relative educational advantage or disadvantage. Indeed, the educational attainment of parents has been found to be one of the most persistent predictors of levels achieved by their children.[12] NCES reports that a 1975 high school senior from a family whose head had four or more years of college was more than twice as likely to plan to pursue a postsecondary education than one whose family head had dropped out of high school.[13] As we shall discuss later in this paper, educational attainment of a parent is proposed as a key eligibility requirement for Title IV programs by some program proponents.

However one slices the population to look at the successes and failures of efforts to equalize educational access and opportunity, the conclusion seems clear. While gains have been made, the nation not only must continue its efforts to expand access to postsecondary education but also must accelerate efforts at retaining new student populations once they enter if equal educational opportunity is to have real and lasting meaning.

---

10. United States Bureau of the Census, *Current Population Reports*, Series P. 20, No. 286, "School Enrollment--Social and Economic Characteristics of Students: October 1974." (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, November 1975).
11. John A. Centra, *College Enrollments in the 1980s: Projections and Possibilities*. (New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978), p. 17.
12. Nancy B. Dearman and Valena White Plisko, *The Condition of Education*, 1979 edition. (Washington, D.C.: National Center for Education Statistics, 1979).
13. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition, p. 108.

It is precisely these objectives--expanding access and increasing retention of disadvantaged students--that Title IV programs aim to advance. Assessing the impact of the programs is difficult since evaluation data are scant. Nevertheless, the evaluations and assessments that have been undertaken suggest that properly targeted Title IV programs do increase the likelihood that disadvantaged populations will gain access to postsecondary education and have greater opportunities for success than if the programs did not exist. The keys appear to be properly targeting services and, concommitantly, providing the appropriate mix of services. A forthcoming assessment of outreach programs similar to Talent Search indicates, for example, that it is not enough simply to provide services. Rather, the services must be based on an explicit understanding of the needs of the target population and accompanying community factors--circumstances that militate against a single-purpose, highly-focused, national intervention strategy.[14] Talent Search, with its general mandate to increase access to postsecondary education, meets these criteria because particular programs are given the flexibility to develop services and employ strategies that will work in their respective areas and with their respective target populations. Sacrificed in the process are specific and common programmatic dimensions on which evaluation across programs can be performed.

Another measure of the success of Talent Search is that, in the 1976-77 program year, 37,615 clients were placed in postsecondary education and another 29,810 were accepted and awaiting entrance. More than 13,000 actual or potential dropouts were persuaded to return or remain in school or college, and about 2,400 clients were enrolled in high school equivalency programs.[15]

Upward Bound has been the most studied of the Title IV programs. Perhaps as a result of more intensive evaluation, the benefits of the program are clearer. The most recent evaluation found, for example, that Upward Bound participants have a significantly higher rate of entry into postsecondary education than do comparable nonparticipants. Stated another way, Upward Bound is positively associated with postsecondary educational entry of more

14. Paul Franklin and Mary Kinnick, *Principles and Practices for Effective Outreach Services* (forthcoming).
15. N. Pyecha et al., *Descriptive Study of the Talent Search Program, A Study of the National Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs*, Vol. III. (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, 1975).

ethnic minorities, more poverty-level students, and more students classified as academic risks in school than would be the case without the program. Perhaps equally important, research has found that Upward Bound students are positive about their program experience and incorporate program objectives into their own behavior and aspirations.[16]

Evaluation studies of the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program are even scantier than for the other TRIO programs. However, Gordon (1975, pp. 16-17), in assessing evaluation findings of programs similar to and including Special Services programs, concludes: "generally, the performance of nontraditional students (served by these programs) has been comparable to regularly enrolled students. Attrition rates have also been comparable, if not somewhat lower, for nontraditional students."[17]

Gordon further concludes:

1. Where programs have been implemented with full systems of student support services, special opportunity students showed equal or higher grade-point averages than regular students of comparable ability and showed equal or higher retention rates than regular students;
2. Where programs with full systems were implemented, special opportunity students show increased self esteem and motivation; and,
3. In programs where few systematic student support services are available or utilized, student achievement, retention rates, and graduation are low.[18]

Given the measurable successes of Title IV support programs, the major challenges appear to be, first, building upon what has been learned and, accordingly, modifying the programs somewhat to increase their potential for success. Second, and most important, the challenge is to expand the availability of the programs so that they can reach larger numbers of their target populations.

This latter challenge may become even more important to society and the viability of postsecondary education in general as the traditional 18 to 22 year old pool of college-eligible prospects becomes not only smaller but increasingly nonwhite. For example, while 13.5 percent of today's 18 year old population is black, it is estimated that the proportion of black 18 year

16. G. J. Burkheimer and Associates, *Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program. A First Followup.* (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, 1977).
17. E. W. Gordon, *Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education*, ERIC/Higher Education Research Report No. 6. (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1975).
18. Ibid., p. 20.

olds will increase to 15.6 percent of that population by 1990.[19] Significantly, that increase will be accompanied by a general decline in the total number of 18 year olds (three quarters as many as there are today, by some estimates) making black students an increasingly important target population for postsecondary institutions already facing dwindling enrollments.

The number of Hispanic 18 year olds, many of whom will be hampered by language as well as educational and economic barriers, will increase significantly as well, particularly in the Southwest and in New York State, where they may comprise as much as 30 percent of the total 18 year old population.

All but one of the supportive service programs contained in Title IV of the Higher Education Act target on these educationally disenfranchised populations. The exception is the separately authorized Education Information Centers (EIC) program designed to bring educational information within reach of all citizens in each state.

Despite minimal funding ($3 million for FY 79), the EIC authority itself is an important federal policy recognition that all prospective educational consumers need access to good information and counseling services if they are to make satisfactory educational choices. Franklin (1979) concludes, for example:

> ...regardless of demographic characteristics, common client needs are for information on educational opportunities, occupations, and financial resources; for assistance with career and life planning, and for support during the process of entering and progressing through postsecondary education.[20]

In addition, while federal support for postsecondary education has traditionally focused on young people, over 40 percent of today's postsecondary students are 25 years old or over. The unemployed and underemployed, mid-career changers, and displaced homemakers as well as part-time students are among the key segments of the newly emerging adult clientele. Yet, equal educational opportunity for adults is not now a reality. For example, adults earning less than $3,000 in 1975 participated in postsecondary educa-

---

19. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition, p. 31.
20. Paul L. Franklin et al., *Educational Information and Advisement Services, A Resource Guide for Creating Local Services and Building Statewide Networks.* (Washington, D.C.: United States Government Printing Office, 1979).

tion at a rate only slightly over 4 percent, while the participation rate for those earning over $25,000 was over 19 percent. Moreover, minority and disadvantaged adults are not now participating in significant numbers.[21] Like other nontraditional clienteles served by Title IV supportive service programs, adult students--particularly low-income adults and those from racial minorities--have a demonstrable need for information, counseling, and other support services if they are to realize the advantage of a post-secondary education.[22]

Furthermore, the passage by the 95th Congress of the Middle Income Student Assistance Act (MISAA) makes the EIC program even more important in facilitating the delivery of increased student financial aid authorized by the act to the newly eligible populations. This view is corroborated by research findings indicating that there is an information gap in student understanding of costs and aid availability that significantly influences whether students will enter postsecondary education at all and, if so, where they will attend.[23] A 1976 College Scholarship Service study concludes, for example:

> It is difficult to quantify the effect of lack of adequate information about available aid resources. However, existing data show that enrolled students have sufficient or inaccurate information about their chances of getting aid. If students enrolled do not know about aid, it seems reasonable to assume that students in high school know even less.[24]

Expanding student financial aid eligibility is likely not enough to insure broad utilization of aid opportunities, unless those for whom the aid is intended have sufficient information about their own eligibility and the potential of the aid for defraying institutional costs. With some modification and more adequate funding, the EIC program could provide an important method for getting the word and assistance out to new populations made eligible by MISAA, while serving the needs of the growing population of adult learners.

In sum, four considerations underline the continued importance of the

---

21. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition, p. 106.
22. Solomon Arbeiter et al., *Forty Million Americans in Career Transition*. (New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978).
23. College Scholarship Service, *Making It Count: A Report on a Project to Provide Better Financial Aid Information To Students*. (New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1976), p. 11.
24. Ibid.

Title IV support service programs:

1. The nation has yet to realize fully its goal of equal educational access and opportunity.

2. An increasing proportion of the traditional-age college students will be nonwhite, requiring continued if not accelerated support once program participants enroll in a postsecondary institution.

3. The extension of student financial aid programs to middle income students requires continued and greater effort to deliver information about aid opportunities to those eligible if they are to take advantage of those opportunities.

4. The increasing numbers of adults who are seeking postsecondary education need counseling and information services.

Through the impending reauthorization of the Higher Education Act and the subsequent process of rewriting program regulations, legislators and program administrators have an opportunity to make the Title IV support service programs serve current and new populations of students more effectively.

The approaches available for making program adjustments depend to a great extent on one's orientation. For example, those concerned with enhancing adult learning opportunities might well argue that the focus of TRIO programs on youth ought to be extended to a broader age group. Others might argue that other programmatic responses to adult learners ought to be made so as not to dilute the important traditional mission of TRIO programs in serving disadvantaged youth.

Those concerned with overlap and duplication among the various program authorities might argue for eliminating specific programs, replacing them with two broad authorities--one to focus on access and preparation and one to concentrate on retention and completion services--leaving it to the Office of Education to develop specific focuses through program regulations. Conversely, others may argue that overlap among the authorities is not of the magnitude or importance necessary to stimulate such a dramatic change in the TRIO authority.

And thus it is likely to go--issue by issue--as legislators and program administrators reshape Title IV support service programs. The following section of this report addresses some of the issues in this debate.

III. Overarching Issues and Options

Introduction

This section of the report identifies overarching issues related to the effectiveness of the Title IV support service programs in delivering integrated and comprehensive information, counseling, referral, and retention services as part of the nation's greater commitment to equal educational opportunity. While the concentration is on Title IV, subpart 4, TRIO programs, discussion of the Educational Information Center authority, particularly as it relates to TRIO programs, is presented as well. Subsequent sections of the report look at the programs individually, identifying issues and suggesting alternatives that would enhance their individual contributions to equal opportunity.

A. What Should be the Authorization Level for the TRIO Programs?

The Fiscal Year 1979 authorization level for TRIO programs is $200 million, with the actual appropriation set at $140 million.[25] Such a disparity between the authorization level and actual appropriations has been the pattern historically.

The case for increasing both the authorization and appropriation levels is persuasive. As noted earlier, at current levels the TRIO programs are able to serve only a small percentage of the eligible populations. While TRIO funding has doubled in the past four years, it still lags far behind the need for services. For too long the TRIO programs have been a neglected stepchild of the burgeoning federal financial aid programs, which now spend over $4 billion annually. Yet recent research and experience plainly demonstrate that financial assistance is not enough. In assessing college enrollments in the 1980s, Centra (1978, p. 18) points out:

> In the past decade or so, generous student aid programs directed at low-income families have helped larger numbers of minority students and other economically disadvantaged students attend college. Many of these same

25. TRIO programs are forward funded. Hence, FY 1979 program operations are funded by FY 78 appropriations, which were $115 million. Since FY 69, there has been a single authorization, and thus a lump-sum annual appropriation, for all the programs included under the Special Programs for Disadvantaged Students subpart of the Higher Education Act. See appendix for an historical summary of TRIO program authorization and appropriation levels.

students are also from educationally disadvantaged backgrounds so there is a greater likelihood that they will have academic difficulties in college. Regardless of race, students with weaker academic backgrounds and abilities are less likely to complete college. Minority retention rates--hence enrollment totals--might best be increased by improving the academic skills of students before attending college and, to some extent, through remedial work in the early college years.[26]

TRIO programs are designed to provide exactly the kinds of services for which Centra and others argue.

In the 1980 extension of Title IV, Congress will once again set the authorization level for TRIO. Traditionally and perhaps unavoidably, authorization levels appear haphazard and arbitrary. Moreover, federal fiscal constraints are likely to be tight as reauthorization approaches. Nonetheless, it will be essential to increase the authority for TRIO programs to recognize their vital importance in advancing equal opportunity and to allow for the expansion required in the early 1980s.

The National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, an ad hoc coalition of 10 regional associations of TRIO programs, has proposed that the overall TRIO authorization be doubled from $200 million to $400 million, with increasingly higher appropriations phased in over the course of the authorization period.

An alternative approach for setting the general authorization figure would be to:

Tie TRIO funding to Basic Educational Opportunity Grant (or BEOG plus federal campus-based programs) appropriations in each fiscal year.

This approach would offer both a rationale and a mechanism for adjusting TRIO appropriations from year to year. To reflect the conceptual and practical linkage between financial aid and supportive services, the authorizing law would set funding levels for TRIO as a percentage of appropriations for either BEOG alone or BEOG plus the campus-based student assistance programs (Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grants, National Direct Student Loans, College Work-Study). As an example, a 20 percent tie-in to BEOG alone would yield (in fiscal 1980) roughly a $500 million appropriation for TRIO. The authorizing committees might build the percentage figure into the authorizing statute as a ceiling on yearly appropriations or, alternatively, as a

26. Centra, *College Enrollments in the 1980s: Projections and Possibilities*, p. 18.

mandatory minimum or "threshold" funding level similar to the provisions governing the three campus-based federal aid programs, which must be funded above certain levels as a condition of paying out BEOGs.

If authorization and appropriation levels are to be increased, the question becomes on what basis those increases should be allocated among programs and whether they ought to be targeted on particular problems of delivering access and retention services to nontraditional students. To some extent, the potential answers are dependent on knowing specific appropriation levels. In the absence of that, however, the following represent some alternatives that can be applied independently or as a coordinated strategy of distributing any increased appropriations:

1. *Increase the Number of Special Services for Disadvantaged Students Programs that Are Funded.* The attrition of nontraditional students, particularly minority students, continues to be distressingly high. If more institutions have SSDS programs with the appropriate mix of services, the issue of retention of nontraditional students can be better addressed.

2. *Target New SSDS Programs to Four-Year Colleges and Universities.* In 1976, about 42 percent of blacks enrolled at all levels of higher education were in two-year colleges, compared with one-third of whites.[27] Similar disparities exist for Hispanic students. Correspondingly, minority populations continue to be underrepresented in scientific, technical, and professional fields. One funding option that could help to correct both disparities is to target all or a significant number of new SSDS programs on four-year institutions. A preference might even be given to institutions that have strong technical, professional, and/or science curriculums.

3. *Increase the Average Awards to Talent Search Programs.* More intensive preenrollment counseling services could be provided, and at an earlier age, if projects had the added resources necessary to support more concerted service efforts.

4. *Increase the Number of Educational Opportunity Centers, Particularly for Serving Disadvantaged Adults.* The EOC Program is the smallest of the TRIO programs, with 38 projects funded in Fiscal Year 1980. If the EOC

27. Bernard C. Watson, "Through The Academic Gateway," *Change*, Vol. 11, No. 7 (October 1979), pp. 24-28.

program is to have a pervasive impact, particularly if it is to serve as a major vehicle for meeting the needs of disadvantaged adults, many more projects need to be funded.

5. *Increase the Proportion of Funds Earmarked in TRIO Projects for Career Exploration and Development Activities.* Research indicates that the career and occupational development of minority students is considerably below that of their white counterparts.[28] Increased funding and development activities in all TRIO programs can help to reduce this disparity.

6. *Increase the Number of Upward Bound Projects.* According to the National Center for Education Statistics, differences remain in the school progress rates (i.e., modal rate) for black and Hispanic children and are most pronounced for those 14 to 17 years old.[29] The remedial services provided by Upward Bound aim at increasing students' skills. Moreover, evaluation indicates that Upward Bound has a positive impact on increasing postsecondary enrollments of poverty-level and minority students, as mentioned previously. Funding additional Upward Bound projects should help to continue this latter trend, particularly since blacks and Hispanics will be an increasing proportion of the 18 to 22 year old college-eligible pool in the 1980s.

7. *Target New Projects in All Programmatic Areas on Specific State and/or Regional Needs.* For example, SSDS programs with strong bilingual components ought to be given preference in states and regions where Hispanic populations are increasing. Implementing this principle will require both analysis of state and regional needs and administrative flexibility to respond to identifiable trends.

B. Is There Overlap and Duplication among Title IV Support Service Programs that Should be Eliminated?

The genesis of Title IV support service programs was in the Higher Education Act of 1965 and the initiation of Talent Search. Since that time, each reauthorization of the act has seen the addition of at least one new program fashioned to meet some particular need (or set of needs) perceived as important in extending educational opportunity to still underserved constituencies.

This serial approach to program authorization not surprisingly finds some

28. Dearman and Plesko, *The Condition of Education*, 1979 edition, p. 7.
29. Ibid., p. 46.

real and potential duplication and overlap among the program authorities. Talent Search and Educational Opportunity Centers are cited frequently, for example, as overlapping in authority if not closely duplicative in the services they provide. However, duplication and overlap in the legislative authority do not necessarily mean that there is actual service duplication occurring in practice. The likelihood that EOC and Talent Search may in practice overlap or duplicate services is, at least to some extent, limited by federal program regulations that stipulate that EOCs coordinate services to individuals with Talent Search and other programs in their service area and identify steps taken to avoid duplication. Similarly, Talent Search program regulations require that projects "not duplicate" services of an EOC operating in their service area.

EOC directors contacted in the preparation of this report indicated that there are varying degrees of coordination with contiguous Talent Search projects, and where coordination does not exist, it is not because they are competing to serve the same clients but because there is little bona fide need for coordinated efforts. For example, Nathan Johns, director of the computer-based EOC in New York City--a city where several Talent Search projects are also located--indicates that both the city and the eligible populations for Talent Search and EOC services are so large that there is never a problem in staking out discrete service areas or populations. Even so, elements of coordination do exist, including a cooperative arrangement between the EOC and the Queens area Talent Search project whereby the latter uses the EOC's computer system to provide its clients with information on postsecondary educational opportunities in New York.

With one exception, all other locations where an EOC and one or more Talent Search projects exist are large urban areas with sizable low-income and minority populations.[30] Hence it is not likely that service overlap is a practical problem, whether or not strong mechanisms of coordination actually exist. According to Office of Education officials, the likelihood of service overlap is even further reduced inasmuch as they make a concerted effort not

30. The exception is found in New Mexico where an EOC is located in Espanola with two Talent Search programs operating in close but not contiguous locations. Since the EOC does not operate in the same or contiguous area as the Talent Search programs, it is doubtful that service duplication occurs in New Mexico either.

to fund a Talent Search or an EOC project where there is already sufficient program coverage.

Thus, one reasonable option for dealing with overlap in the legislative authority of EOC and Talent Search programs is to do nothing while maintaining or strengthening coordination language in the program regulations.

Among the most logical other options for addressing the apparent overlap between EOC and Talent Search authorities are:

1. *Eliminate One of the Programs.* Certainly, there is the opportunity to eliminate one program authority, thereby eradicating overlap in the statute. This solution may be appealing in times of government austerity, but it has obvious, perhaps compelling, practical disadvantages.

First and foremost is that both Talent Search and EOC programs are operational and provide bona fide services to large numbers of low income and disadvantaged people who are seeking postsecondary education. And what criteria should be used to determine which one should be eliminated?

Second, eliminate one program and there are no guarantees that the other will be able to fill the concomitant service void. Of course, the resources saved from whichever program is eliminated could be used to fund additional projects under the authority that is retained. But what is gained by that approach beyond a tidier legislative authority?

2. *Make One New Program from the Best of the Talent Search and EOC Programs.* In view of the legislative similarity of the two programs, this option might prove the most logical if reducing overlap in the statute is a high priority. The new authority could maintain a focus on providing pre-enrollment services as is currently the case for both Talent Search and EOCs. Additionally, a new authority might:

Drop the Talent Search target on low-income youth and utilize current EOC language of providing services to anyone residing in a community or geographic area with a high concentration of low-income people.

Maintain some emphasis on decreasing secondary school dropout rates as is required currently for Talent Search but add the capability for the new authority to provide tutorial services to potential dropouts and others not yet enrolled in postsecondary education when those services are otherwise unavailable to the target population.

Maintain the current EOC language that allows provision of counseling, tutoring, and other academic support services for those enrolled in post-secondary education but include strong mandates for coordination with Special Services projects where they exist.

While combining the best of both Talent Search and EOC might make for a strong program, it would have disadvantages, including termination of the histories and public awareness of current Talent Search and EOC projects. Too, such a comprehensive program would most certainly require significantly higher per project funding amounts than awarded currently to the average Talent Search and perhaps even higher amounts than the average received by existing EOCs.

3. *Retain the Talent Search Focus on Serving Youth while Limiting EOCs to Serving Adults.* The advantages of this option are that it maintains both program authorities while eliminating the legislative overlap through targeting EOCs and Talent Search on different populations. "Exceptional circumstances" language could be included for each program, thereby allowing a Talent Search program to serve adults when an EOC does not exist in its service area and an EOC to serve youth when no Talent Search exists.

A potential advantage of this option is that it provides clear policy recognition of the supportive service needs of the growing numbers of adult learners by targeting EOCs on that specific population. But is targeting EOCs on adults an adequate response to this concern? There currently exist relatively very few EOCs--22 in Fiscal Year 1979. Even with 16 new EOCs as projected in FY 1980, retargeting the program to serve adult learners would be a token gesture at best, without significantly broader implementation so that the program reaches sizable numbers of disadvantaged adult learners in need of service. Would Talent Search programs be able to accommodate the younger clientele now being served by the current EOCs?

Beyond that, it is difficult to argue with this option for reducing overlap between Talent Search and EOCs. Its ultimate efficacy, however, seems inextricably tied to increasing appropriation levels for both Talent Search and Educational Opportunity Centers. Without increased appropriations (and thereby more Talent Search projects to fill the service void for youth created by targeting EOCs on adults), EOCs could be expected to invoke the proposed "exceptional circumstances" clause in most cases. And, without increased appropriations and the consequent implementation of larger numbers of EOCs, extant centers can hardly be expected to have a significant impact on meeting the service needs of disadvantaged adult learners.

In summary, although there is noticeable overlap in the statute for Talent

Search and EOC programs, there is little evidence to suggest that the result is, in practice, duplication of service. The EOC program is relatively small and where EOCs and Talent Search programs do exist in the same or contiguous locations, in almost every case the location is a large urban area with sizable, eligible populations. Hence, any action taken to reduce or eliminate duplication should focus on simplifying or clarifying the legislative authority for EOC and Talent Search; a fundamental adjustment of operations in the field is not needed.

Beyond the alternatives for changing Talent Search and EOC programs, a strong case can be made for reducing overlap in the statute by eliminating the Service Learning Center program, which has never received an appropriation. It is not operational and closely duplicates the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program.

Most other suggestions for reducing overlap and duplication among TRIO programs appear to be cosmetic rather than substantive and perhaps are best mediated by language that enhances the integration and/or coordination of the various programs.[31]

C. Should Stronger Integration of and/or Coordination among the Programs be Specified? Among Other Programs Targeted on the Disadvantaged?

There are several possibilities for strengthening coordination of the programs to increase their collective effectiveness and simultaneously reduce the prospects that overlap and duplication in service will actually occur. Among them are:

1. Strengthen the integration of Upward Bound, Talent Search, EOCs and Special Services for Disadvantaged programs by requiring, or strongly recommending, that programs operating in contiguous target areas serve the same students at different stages in their educational advancement. This alternative is to some extent dependent upon modifying current age requirements downward and providing sufficient appropriations for broader implementation of the TRIO programs. Students would be identified at an early

31. Some TRIO program proponents have recommended distinguishing between campus-based and community-based programs in the legislative authority. While this distinction may have merit from the standpoint of making the programs more distinguishable and explicable, it would not appear to have a substantive impact on the operation of the programs.

age--after the sixth grade, for example--and provided with a broad range of services through secondary school and college. Provision could be included for all the programs to serve others who, for whatever reason, are identified at later periods in their educational development. This alternative would more closely integrate TRIO program service delivery, and--except for increasing appropriations--could be pursued through statutory or regulatory revision.

2. Modify the program regulations for Educational Information Centers to increase their utilization of Talent Search and EOC programs. Doing this would help insure that newly-established EICs do not duplicate services already provided by existing Talent Search and EOC programs while still allowing for widespread delivery of information, referral, and counseling services to all citizens in the state. New program regulations could:

Require that Talent Search and EOC project representatives be involved in framing the annual EIC state plan;

Require an EIC advisory board to include representatives of extant EOC and Talent Search projects;

Mandate that existing EOCs and Talent Search projects be designated as EIC centers in their respective geographic areas, at least for those populations they are serving currently, with the projects to receive a "fair share" of any resources or support services made available to other designated sites by the state EIC program.

3. Include provision in the TRIO legislation indicating that the intent of Congress is for the CETA and TRIO programs to cooperate closely and, whenever possible, to coordinate services. The provision, perhaps, should more specifically indicate that participation in Upward Bound--particularly summer residential programs--qualifies students for eligibility under the CETA summer youth employment programs. Also, Upward Bound projects should be identified explicitly as eligible CETA worksites. This would help foster cooperation between these two programs, and articulate a closer relationship between summer work programs as offered by CETA and Upward Bound's goal of advancing longer term academic and career development for disadvantaged youth.

4. Include parallel language in the Title IV student aid and TRIO authorities that reserves and allocates to Talent Search, EOC, and Upward Bound projects a certain percentage of Supplemental Educational Opportunity Grant (SEOG) funds. This proposal would, again, recognize the inseparability

of support service programs and student financial assistance programs in realizing equal educational opportunity for all citizens. While careful prescription of operating procedures and regulations would be required, it would have the advantages of:

Reducing the likelihood that institutions will use SEOG funds to enhance enrollments of more traditional students at the expense of low-income and/or disadvantaged students;

Giving Talent Search, EOC, and Upward Bound projects--coupled with BEOG grants that already go directly to students--more bargaining power in getting their clients admitted to institutions that might otherwise be less inclined to admit or finance disadvantaged students.

D. Is There a Need to Specify Further and/or Alter the Participant Eligibility Requirements for the TRIO Programs? Who Should be Served?

Each reauthorization of the Higher Education Act of 1965 has included not only the addition of programs to the TRIO program subpart but also modifications to participant eligibility requirements. Through the years, however, the programs have been consistently and predominantly targeted on youth cut off from the majority society, particularly the poor, minorities, and the educationally disadvantaged.

While the emphasis on these populations seems well understood by Congress and the educational community, participant eligibility requirements are not sharply or clearly delineated in the current legislation nor in the accompanying federal regulations. Evaluations of TRIO programs, for example, describe TRIO eligibility criteria as "amorphous," "vague," and often "inadequate" for consistent interpretation of who is to be served.[32]

The legislation currently contains "umbrella" requirements for participant eligibility for all the programs:

Services...shall be specifically designed to assist in enabling youths from low-income families who have academic potential, but who may lack adequate secondary school preparation, who may be physically handicapped, or who may be disadvantaged because of severe rural isolation, to enter, continue, or resume postsecondary education...

Each program has additional eligibility criteria prescribed in the law and usually further delineated in the program regulations. For example, the law says that Talent Search is to serve "qualified youths of financial or

32. See J. N. Pyecha et al., *A Study of the National Upward Bound and Talent Search Programs*.

cultural need with an exceptional potential for postsecondary training." Program regulations must then define such amorphous qualifiers as "cultural need" and "exceptional potential."

The problems with current requirements are many:

There is some conflict between the "umbrella" language and additional qualifying language for each program. For example, the "umbrella" requirements target the programs specifically on low-income youth who may also experience other disadvantages (e.g., be physically handicapped). Qualifying language for the Special Services for Disadvantaged Students program, however, modifies that requirement so dramatically that virtually anyone can be made eligible who can be determined to need the program's services.[33]

Beyond the "umbrella" language, there is inconsistency in eligibility requirements among the programs. Hence, all Upward Bound participants must meet low-income requirements while only two-thirds of Talent Search participants must meet low-income criteria, and so on.

Qualifying language included for each program as further definition of participant eligibility is often vague and difficult if not impossible to define. "Academic potential," "demonstrated aptitude," and "cultural need" are among the qualifying phrases included, apparently to further delineate who is to be served. In fact, they lack specificity and lead to inconsistent interpretations.

The standard criteria in the program regulations for defining "low income" do not account for regional or state differences in cost of living and generally may be too restrictive.

The arbitrary definition of "youth" as one aged 14 through 27 opens the programs to some who are usually considered adults (i.e., those aged 24 to 27) while ignoring youth below age 14 who might profit from program services. Moreover, delineation of age parameters in the program regulations instead of the statute may find the TRIO authority in conflict with the Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1978.

These and other problems exacerbate clear definition of who is to be served and often impede program operations. Both legislative and regulatory streamlining is needed. Part of the task is to simplify eligibility requirements and make them more consistent and explicable, regardless of the specific target population(s). But, most important, the substantive issue is who shall the programs serve? Should they be targeted on the poorest of the poor? Or are there dimensions other than--or in addition to--poverty upon which participant eligibility should be based? Should the programs continue to

33. Program regulations for Special Services read that services shall be provided to enrolled or accepted students who "...by reason of deprived educational, cultural, or economic background or physical handicap, or limited English-speaking ability, are in need of such services. . .". Thus, only when "deprived economic background" is used to certify participant eligibility do low-income criteria apply.

focus on youth? Or should they be opened, in whole or in part, to serve disadvantaged adult learners as well?

Several alternatives for addressing these issues exist. Perhaps the simplest yet most dramatic alternative would be to eliminate specific programs, replacing them with two broad authorities--one that focuses on access and preparation and one that concentrates on retention and completion. This alternative could facilitate a simple legislative authority, leaving it to the Office of Education to define eligible populations more clearly by program regulations. The legislative authority, for example, might only prescribe that services be targeted on individuals in need of special assistance, leaving it to the program regulations to define which individuals are in need of what services. The Office of Education could then adjust program regulations as necessary to target services on particular groups, based on current and projected needs. Needs of a specific population or geographic region could be met through targeting project awards. For example, retention and completion projects funded in the Southwest might be required to include bilingual counseling, tutoring, and academic course components, in view of the increasing proportion of those of postsecondary education age who will be Spanish-speaking in the 1980s. Access and preparation projects funded in the sparsely populated West might be required to focus on the rurally isolated.

There are obvious disadvantages to this alternative, however, not the least of which is the dissolution of existing programs, along with their established constituencies and community recognition. Moreover, few would be comfortable vesting the Office of Education with virtually total authority in determining specific populations to be served and in targeting services. Additionally, this option might be in conflict with the Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1978, unless the TRIO statute were to specify the age parameters of those to be served or, in the absence of such specification, open services to all individuals, regardless of age.

Another alternative would be to maintain the individual programs and target them consistently on first-generation college students who would also need to meet revised low-income criteria to be eligible. Recommended by the National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations (NCCEOA), this alternative would define "first generation" as one whose

natural or adopted parents have not completed a baccalaureate degree. Low-income criteria would limit participation to those whose family income is below 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria--an upward shift from current income requirements.

Except for age limitations peculiar to each program, this alternative would eliminate most other qualifying language and provide more definable and uniform eligibility requirements for all TRIO programs.[34] (See Section IV for a suggested application of these requirements for each of the TRIO programs.) Moreover, proponents indicate that the revised income criteria would open all the TRIO programs to the children of lower income working-class families who generally lack educated role models and exposure to higher education as a practical option and, as a group, embody a high proportion of the nation's black and Spanish-speaking populations. Furthermore, NCES statistics indicate that those just above the poverty level are less inclined to pursue a postsecondary education than are those from below the poverty level,[35] adding justification to the upward revision of the income criteria.

While this alternative tends generally to broaden the eligible participant population, it would place more definable restrictions on some of the programs, notably the Special Services program, which currently is open effectively to any student who can demonstrate a need for program services.

In summary, this alternative unquestionably makes participant eligibility requirements more specific and uniform. To be sure, there is a relationship between the educational attainment of parents and the aspirations and rates of postsecondary enrollment of their children.[36] The traditional emphasis on serving those from low-income families would also be preserved, by requiring that at least two-thirds of those served by each program meet both the first generation and the revised low-income criteria.

Concerns about the appropriateness of the first generation criterion have

34. NCCEOA's proposal would require that two-thirds of the participants of all programs mee both first generation and the revised low-income criteria or be physically handicapped. The remaining one-third could be qualified by meeting one or the other criteria, or in the case of Special Services, be physically handicapped.
35. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition, p. 108.
36. Ibid.

been addressed in supporting material prepared by NCCEOA,[37] save two: (1) Data compiled by NCCEOA indicate that virtually the same individuals would be eligible for the TRIO programs if 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria were used as the sole eligibility criterion as would be eligible if the first generation college student criterion was introduced.[38] The question, then; is why introduce a new criterion and concept at all, if modified income criteria alone will lead to serving virtually the same desired target population? (2) What process can be used to document simply and accurately that a prospective client is, indeed, a first generation college student? While perhaps no more difficult for the programs to document than some of the current criteria (e.g., exceptional potential, demonstrated aptitude, etc.), the process for administering and documenting first generation student status needs to be worked out to insure that the criterion is indeed simpler, more easily explained, and workable than are existing criteria. To meet those tests, the burden of proof should be on the programs and not placed on the prospective student.

A third and less dramatic alternative to current eligibility criteria is to continue the historical emphasis of the programs on serving those from low-income families while striking for greater uniformity in eligibility requirements among the programs. This alternative could include combinations of the following options, each of which would make eligibility requirements more definable and consistent, and frequently more applicable to current and projected trends in the postsecondary education population:

1. *Eliminate ambiguous language in the "umbrella" eligibility requirements*, notably "academic potential" and "lack of adequate secondary school [preparation]." Neither qualifier is easy to define nor to apply as eligibility criteria, and they can be seen as conflicting statements. Other umbrella focuses--severe rural isolation and being physically handicapped--could be maintained or eliminated and, in the latter case, emphasized in the regulations for particular programs, to insure that historically significant target populations continue to be served. Primary emphasis for eligibility, then, would be on low-income students who need special services to enter or complete a postsecondary education. In fact, this simplification of eligibility requirements might well eliminate the need for "umbrella" requirements altogether. Low-income criteria could be delineated within each program authority as well as any additional qualifying language appropriate for a particular program.
2. *Modify criteria used to define low income*. If the TRIO programs are to

37. See particularly, F. F. Adachi, "Analysis of the First Generation Population (A New Concept in Higher Education)." (Laramie, Wyoming: The University of Wyoming, 1979).
38. The overlap for individuals aged 18 to 24 between 150 percent of poverty and first generation student status is 98.3 percent, according to NCCEOA figures.

be targeted uniformly and directly on those from low-income families, a strong case can be made for upward modification in the income cutoffs now in force.[39] Current income criteria set an unrealistically low upper limit and if used as the primary measure of certifying participant eligibility, would find the programs able to serve only the poorest of the poor. Moreover, current levels fail to account for state or regional cost of living differences, which can be dramatic in regions like the Northeast, and states like Alaska.[40] Use of current income criteria would also prohibit the provision of services to disadvantaged populations who live just above the poverty level--a group that has been mentioned as even less inclined to pursue a postsecondary education than the group below the poverty level.[41]

There are three appropriate options if low-income criteria are to be used as the primary eligibility requirement for TRIO programs:

Define low income as those from families with taxable incomes less than 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria. Although not tied to regional or state cost of living differences, this option would help account for such differences and, perhaps most important, would make eligible those who live marginally above the poverty level and who are in need of supportive services.[42]

Allow individual projects to define "low income" as determined by local cost of living levels, with a regulatory requirement that the determination be based on, and documented by, supporting data.

Establish an income indexing scale that takes into account regional and/or state cost of living differences. Any of a number of formulas could be used. The disadvantage to this approach might well be the addition of undue complexity to program regulations.

3. *Modify or eliminate the youth requirement while maintaining the focus on low-income populations.* The "umbrella" requirements in the current legislation target the programs on youth who are defined by program regulations as those aged 14 to 27. It can be argued that this arbitrary definition of youth denies services to some younger students who could well profit from the services of Talent Search and Upward Bound, in particular. Additionally, some who are usually considered adults are encompassed by setting an upper limitation of age 27. Moreover, the "youth" requirement is not consistently applied, since EOCs may serve anyone, regardless of age, who resides in the target area. Among the options available are:

Eliminate "youth" as an eligibility criterion in the legislation, targeting the programs on low-income "individuals." Particular program authorities could stipulate which individuals are to be served if such delineation is deemed necessary. Or the program regulations could suggest the types of indi-

---

39. Program regulations currently use the poverty criteria established by the Bureau of Census and as published in *Current Population Reports.*

40. TRIO directors in Alaska, for example, estimate that a more nearly accurate indicator of poverty in the bush country would be 250 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty level.

41. See discussion and citation in the beginning of Section II.

42. The National Council of Equal Educational Opportunity Associations estimates that 60 percent of all black families and 70 percent of Spanish-surnamed families live above the poverty level--some of whom would be made eligible by raising the income criteria to 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria.

viduals to be served, leaving it to local programs to target services on those determined most in need at the local level. This option would most probably extend the programs to greater numbers of disadvantaged adult learners.

Maintain the focus on youth, but redefine youth as those between ages 12 and 24. This redefinition would allow the programs to serve disadvantaged students at an earlier age, while setting an upper limit more consistent with traditional educational definitions of "youth." On the other hand, it ignores the needs of emerging adult learners and would likely eliminate Upward Bound programs currently targeted on Vietnam veterans.

Do some of both of the above by targeting most programs on youth, defined as those aged 12 to 24, but through funding set-asides, demonstration grants, and/or by targeting Educational Opportunity Centers on adults, recognize and serve increasing disadvantaged adult populations.

Whatever the case, if age is to be used as an eligibility requirement, age parameters ought to be included in the legislative authority to avoid potential conflict with the Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1978.

Beyond the foregoing, participant eligibility requirements could be improved by eliminating much of the imprecise qualifying language that exists in the authorities and regulations for the programs. The next section of this report includes a program by program assessment of these and other options for changing the respective program authorities.

IV. Issues and Options by Program

There are numerous possibilities for modifying the Title IV support service programs individually that might well help clarify their purpose and scope and enhance their respective operations. Offered by various proponents of the programs or suggested by evaluation findings, many of the issues and alternatives described below suggest modifications in federal program regulations as well as in law.

A. Special Services for Disadvantaged Students

1. *Participant Eligibility Requirements.* The Special Services Program authority requires that those eligible for services are enrolled or accepted students with academic potential

> ...who, (i) by reason of deprived educational, cultural, or economic background, or physical handicap, are in need of such services to assist them to initiate, continue, or resume their postsecondary education or (ii) by reason of limited English-speaking ability are in need of bilingual educational teaching, guidance, and counseling in order to enable them to pursue a postsecondary education.

These criteria define an obviously broader target population than do the TRIO "umbrella" requirements that target the programs primarily on youth from low-income families.[43] In fact, Special Services criteria are so expansive that virtually anyone with academic potential and a need for services can be certified as eligible, regardless of socioeconomic background. The result is an "...amorphous target population that defies rational definition."[44]

The avenues available for bringing greater specificity and rationality to Special Services participant eligibility requirements depend largely on what changes are made in the "umbrella" requirements for all TRIO programs. For example, if first generation college student status and accompanying criteria (as described previously) are substituted for current "umbrella" requirements, eligibility criteria for Special Services students could specify:

---

43. "Umbrella" requirements also specify certain types of low-income youth to be served, such as the physically handicapped and rurally isolated. But the primary eligibility criterion is low-income youth.
44. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, *Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the United States Office of Education*, Fiscal Year 1977, p. 282.

- That at least two-thirds of the students must (a) meet the first generation criterion and be from families whose taxable incomes are less than 150 percent of the census poverty criteria, or (b) be physically handicapped;[45]
- That the remaining third of the students enrolled must (a) meet the first generation criterion, or (b) be from families whose taxable incomes are less than 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria;
- That all students must be enrolled or accepted for enrollment at the sponsoring institution;
- That participating students should be in need of Special Services.

If low-income criteria--in modified or current form--are used as the primary eligibility requirement for TRIO programs, then the Special Services qualifying language might be modified as follows:

- Eliminate "academic potential" as a qualification. According to the Office of Education's *Annual Evaluation*, academic potential varies widely in definition and no truly satisfactory definition exists.[46]
- Eliminate eligibility "*...by reason of deprived educational, cultural, or economic background or by physical handicap,*" fixing eligibility primarily on participants' meeting the low-income requirements. This would provide greater consistency with "umbrella" requirements. The physically handicapped could continue to be served as a distinct population, either through separate language in the Special Services authority, by special mention in congressional report language, added consideration in the program regulations or, perhaps, through funding set-asides.
- Allow that one-third of those served need not meet low-income requirements to be eligible, but develop a new criterion for determining the eligibility of that one-third that describes a measurable educational deficiency that can be corrected by Special Services. For example, the qualifier might be "*disadvantaged students with deficiencies in basic skills who need and can profit from Special Services.*" While a student's need for special services may not be measurable, basic skills deficiencies are, and program regulations could delineate how they are to be measured and documented.
- Eliminate the "limited English-speaking ability" qualification to bring more consistency and clarity to eligibility requirements. However, special encouragement might well be given in congressional report language for the support of projects to serve specifically those of limited English-speaking ability, particularly in view of the expected increase in Spanish-speaking 18 to 22 year olds in the 1980s. Another alternative would be to establish funding set-asides or special recognition in the program regulations to encourage projects for those of limited English-speaking ability.

Finally, if requirements are modified to focus on individuals rather than youth, Special Services projects for disadvantaged adults ought to be supported, if not through funding set-asides or in direct proportion to the

45. Thus, physically handicapped students would be made separately eligible without needing to meet first generation or low-income requirements.
46. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, *Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the United States Office of Education*, Fiscal Year 1977, p. 282.

number of funded projects for youth, at least on a demonstration basis. Conversely, if emphasis in the overall authority remains on youth, a new clause in the authority might well be added to allow support of demonstration projects for disadvantaged adult learners.[47]

2. *Eligible Project Applicants.* The present TRIO authority includes "umbrella" language that covers applicant eligibility for all of the programs. Those eligible are:

> institutions of higher education, including institutions with vocational and career education programs, combinations of such institutions, public and private agencies and organizations (including professional and scholarly associations), and in exceptional cases, secondary schools and secondary vocational schools....

Critics argue that only institutions offering at least a baccalaureate degree or a minimum of two years' work to a baccalaureate degree ought to be eligible to sponsor Special Services projects. A strong case can be made for those limitations inasmuch as low-income and minority students continue to be underrepresented in academically-oriented institutions.[48]

In addition, institutional eligibility might well be modified to include graduate institutions, facilitating the funding and targeting of Special Services projects to assist disadvantaged students through graduate programs, particularly in professional and technical areas where minority group members continue to be severely underrepresented (e.g., medicine, engineering, and other technical and science-related areas).[49] This modification in institutional eligibility perhaps could be affected by program regulations.

3. *Program Service Scope.* The Special Services program authority and accompanying regulations tend to suggest service areas rather than service strategies. As a result, the breadth and scope of services needed to enhance retention and completion rates of disadvantaged students may not be well understood and may mean that some will see the Special Services program as nothing more than an expensive, federally-supported tutorial service. Misunderstanding is

---

47. Adult learners are generally regarded as having different motivations, enrollment patterns, learning styles, and service needs than do younger students. Hence, if the Special Services program is opened to adults, it is advisable to establish separate projects for them.
48. Golladay and Noell, editors, *The Condition of Education*, 1978 edition, p. 118.
49. Ibid., pp. 140-143.

perhaps reinforced by the dearth of evaluation of Special Services programs and other similar compensatory programs.[50]

Basic to a systematic approach to Special Services delivery is provision for participants to receive adequate financial aid to cover educational and living expenses.[51] While current program regulations recognize the importance of financial aid to participant success, the Special Services program could be strengthened by requiring that sponsoring institutions meet the full financial need of Special Services students.[52]

Beyond that, the authority and regulations might well include a set of "core program services" to illustrate the kinds of services that projects would be expected to provide. However, any set of core services included should be clearly labeled as illustrative of the kinds of services that ought to be provided and not as the ultimate or binding service prescription. As Donlon (1978, p. 44) points out,

> There is a great idiosyncrasy to programs for the disadvantaged. They are offered at institutions of different sizes and geographic location; they deal with groups who have in common a low probability of attendance at college but who vary in ethnic, racial, or cultural background; they emphasize slightly different goals, are sponsored by completely different agencies, and although obviously derived from a common theme are not likely to be well served by some single "master" instrument which can be used by all.[53]

With those limitations in mind, core services for the Special Services program might include the following:

a. Basic skill development, particularly in study skills, English, mathematics, and the sciences;

b. Personal, career, and academic counseling;

c. Tutorial assistance;

---

50. It should be mentioned that the Office of Education has recently commissioned the Systems Development Corporation to perform a comprehensive evaluation of the Special Services program that should enhance understanding of the keys to successful programming.

51. E. W. Gordon, *Opportunity Programs for the Disadvantaged in Higher Education*. ERIC Higher Education Research Report No. 6. (Washington, D.C.: American Association for Higher Education, 1975), p. 21.

52. Program regulations currently require institutions to "obtain and provide adequate financial aid" which does not necessarily require sponsoring institutions to meet the full need of students.

53. Thomas F. Donlon, "Affective Considerations," from *The Final Report of National Project II Alternatives to the Revolving Door*, by Richard Donovan, Director. (Washington, D.C.: Bronx Community College for National Project II of the Fund for the Improvement of Postsecondary Education, 1978), p. 44.

d. Academic advising services, including the provision of a "mentor" *for each program participant;*[54]

e. Career exploration services, including appropriate work experience projects in occupational areas of student interest;

f. Learning assistance services, including remedial and special course-work when necessary;

g. Academic enrichment services; and,

h. Assistance in preparing for graduate work, including placement and admissions assistance.

Whil these or a similar set of core services might well be included in the authority and specified further in the program regulations, the Office of Education might also earmark some portion of the Special Services appropriation to fund special demonstration projects to test other mixes of services as well as special focus projects. Similarly, it might encourage diverse service mixes by way of program regulations. (For example, special demonstration projects might be funded to work specifically with high ability disadvantaged students to prepare them better for graduate training in areas in which minority group members continue to be severely under-represented.)

4. *Other Considerations.* The present Special Services program authority does not require sponsoring institutions to commit resources to the support of a SSDS project. While many--perhaps most--do, a case can be made for requiring some match on the part of sponsoring institutions. For example, the limitation of federal support to 90 percent of total costs as required within the Service Learning Center authority might be included for the Special Services program. This option would foster stronger institutional commitment to serving the needs of disadvantaged students and would have the added benefit of freeing some additional funds to support a greater number of projects.

54. Program regulations could further stipulate that each special services participant be assigned a student mentor from her or his chosen academic field. Mentors could be undergraduate or graduate students with demonstrated academic success who would assist their protégés in adjusting to the academic environment, developing study habits, choosing an academic program, choosing specific courses, and so on.

B. Service Learning Centers

Authorized by the Education Amendments of 1976, Service Learning Centers (SLC) have never received an appropriation. The stated legislative intent is that they be located at postsecondary institutions serving substantial numbers of disadvantaged students. The centers are to provide remedial and other special services for students enrolled or accepted for enrollment (two-thirds of the participants must meet low-income requirements) and to serve as a concentrated effort to coordinate and supplement the ability of the institution to furnish support services to its students. Federal funding is limited to 90 percent of costs of establishing and operating such centers.

Without the benefit of an operational history, it is difficult to gauge the role Service Learning Centers might play in enhancing the educational attainment of disadvantaged students. On the surface, the authority seems strikingly similar to the Special Services program. The Conference Committee report on the 1976 Education Amendments states, however, that the centers are not intended to be "...established on campuses where the existing program of special services for disadvantaged students is in operation. While these programs are not identical in all respects, they are sufficiently similar that their presence on the same campus would be a duplicative and wasteful use of scarce resources."[55]

Nonetheless, one might well argue that disadvantaged students might be better served through increasing appropriations for an operating "sufficiently similar" program rather than appropriating for implementation of an entirely new and untested initiative. Thus, as mentioned previously, a strong argument can be made for eliminating the Service Learning Center authority. In doing so, however, some of the better features of the SLC authority might be integrated into the Special Services program. For example, the limitation of federal program support to a maximum of 90 percent of the costs might well be applied to the Special Services program, as mentioned earlier.

C. Upward Bound

Upward Bound is delineated briefly in the legislative authority as

55. House of Representatives Report No. 94-1701, *Conference Report on the Education Amendments of 1976*, p. 183.

programs to be known as "Upward Bound," (A) which are designed to generate skills and motivation necessary for success in education beyond high school and (B) in which enrollees from low-income backgrounds and with inadequate secondary school preparation participate on a substantially full-time basis during all or part of the program.

The abbreviated authority leaves it to convention and program regulations to prescribe more precisely who is to be served and the scope of services to be provided.

1. *Participant Eligibility Requirements.* Program regulations define the goal of Upward Bound as increasing the academic performance and motivational levels of eligible enrollees so that they may complete secondary school and successfully pursue postsecondary education. Eligible enrollees are further described as youth (i.e., those aged 14 through 27) with academic potential who are unlikely to apply for or to be accepted for enrollment in postsecondary education because of a lack of preparation and/or underachievement in secondary school. Participants must be enrolled in (or be a dropout who expects to reenroll in) a target high school located in an area that has a high concentration of low-income families. At the time of selection, participants must have completed the first year of secondary school but not yet entered the twelfth grade.

Recent evaluations of Upward Bound--the most studied of TRIO programs--found that overall, projects appeared to be serving the appropriate kinds of students.[56] Despite these findings, a case can be made for greater specification of the target population in the regulations and/or the law and the elimination of vague qualifying language such as "academic potential," "lack of preparation," and "underachievement." Vague qualifiers might be replaced by more measurable requirements that target services, for example, on secondary school enrollees "deficient in basic skills," perhaps with the added caveat that projects demonstrate that participants have a need for program services.

Beyond these modifications, other changes in eligibility requirements depend largely on what changes are made in "umbrella" requirements for all

56. C. J. Burkheimer and Associates, *Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program, A First Followup.* (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, September 1977).

TRIO programs. If first generation college student status and revised low-income criteria are substituted for current requirements, Upward Bound criteria might require that:

- At least two-thirds of the students meet the first generation criteria and be from families whose taxable incomes are less than 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria;
- The remaining one-third of the students enrolled meet either the first generation criterion or be from families whose taxable incomes are less than 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria;
- All students enrolled are in need of academic support in order to successfully pursue a postsecondary educational program;
- Participants must have completed the eighth grade and be at least 13 years of age and be no more than 19 years of age to be eligible.[57]

Beyond eliminating amorphous qualifying language, the foregoing criteria include three significant changes. First, Upward Bound participation is currently limited to those who come from low-income families, whereas the foregoing criteria would allow up to one-third of the participants to be eligible either by meeting the first generation criterion or the modified low-income criterion.

Second, age limitations would be modified significantly, having two effects:

1. By adjusting the lower age limit from 14 to 13 and making eligible those who have completed the eighth grade, Upward Bound would be able to serve students once they enter secondary school instead of after they have completed the first year of secondary school. Allowing for earlier participation is based on evaluation findings indicating that the enrollment rate in postsecondary education by Upward Bound students is positively related to their length of participation in the program.[58]
2. Adjusting the upper age limits downward from 27 to 19 assures that the program will be targeted on high school youth--the traditional target population of Upward Bound.

Another important effect, however, would be to eliminate Veterans Upward Bound projects that were established by a supplementary appropriation in 1972. Veterans Upward Bound programs could be continued, however, through an "exceptional circumstances" clause, with accompanying regulations used to specify those circumstances as including continuation of veterans programs.

Whether or not such a clause is included should be determined by the need

57. These eligibility criteria are essentially the same as those recommended by the National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations.
58. G. J. Burkheimer and Associates, *Evaluation Study of the Upward Bound Program, A First Followup*. (Research Triangle Park, N.C.: Research Triangle Institute, September 1977).

to continue veterans projects and, if so, whether Upward Bound is the appropriate program to meet that need. If there is a determined need, an alternative to meeting it might be to restructure the Veterans Cost of Instruction Program (VCIP) from an entitlement authority to one that provides funds competitively. Those funds could be targeted to institutions that sponsor Veterans Upward Bound Programs and/or others that have a history of serving large numbers of veterans.

If low-income criteria--in modified or current form--are used as the primary eligibility requirements for TRIO programs, a similar consideration will need to be made regarding the service of veterans before establishing Upward Bound program age limitations. Regardless of the limitations imposed, they probably should be included in the authority to insure compliance with the Age Discrimination Act Amendments of 1978. And, for reasons described previously, a case can be made for adjusting lower age limits to serve students when they enter secondary school initially.

2. *Program Service Scope*. Current legislation does little to define the services to be provided by Upward Bound programs, although program regulations do delineate the particular services to be provided. For reasons mentioned previously, a case can be made for including a set of core services in the legislative authority to illustrate the kinds of services that projects are expected to provide. For Upward Bound they might well include:

a. Basic skill instruction, particularly in reading, writing, study skills, mathematics, and the sciences;

b. Personal, career, and academic counseling;

c. Tutorial services;

d. Academic advising and assistance in high school course selection;

e. Exposure to cultural events, academic programs, and other activities not usually available to disadvantaged youth;

f. Activities designed to acquaint participants with career options, including work-experience and career exploration opportunities;

g. Instruction and other activities designed to introduce participants to, and when appropriate, prepare them for careers in which persons from disadvantaged backgrounds are particularly underrepresented; and,

h. Summer, on-campus residential programs.

With one exception, the services outlined here are basically those included in current Upward Bound program regulations. The exception is providing for instruction and activities designed to introduce and prepare participants in careers in which disadvantaged people are underrepresented. Adding and perhaps emphasizing this service in the program regulations is particularly propitious if disadvantaged students are to overcome educational disadvantages and gain the background necessary to enter many scientific, technical, and professional fields in which they are currently underrepresented. Taking the purpose of this service a step further, some projects might be targeted specifically to educational institutions known for quality programs in fields such as law, medicine, engineering, and other areas in which disadvantaged populations are underrepresented. Moreover, the opportunity to support special demonstration projects might well be utilized to establish Upward Bound projects whose single mission would be to assist disadvantaged secondary students interested in one specific professional or technical field or another to develop better the skills necessary for success in an appropriate college-level training program.

D. Talent Search

1. *Participant Eligibility Requirements.* The Talent Search authority and program regulations target services on youth with financial or cultural need who have exceptional potential for postsecondary educational training, especially those who have delayed pursuing a postsecondary education. In addition, the authority and regulations place priority on serving qualified secondary school and college dropouts of demonstrated aptitude. Two-thirds of Talent Search clients must meet low-income requirements, with the other one-third having to meet all other eligibility requirements.

Talent Search eligibility criteria are laden with amorphous qualifiers that make it difficult to determine who the projects are to serve and equally difficult for projects to demonstrate that they are serving the appropriate constituencies. Such key qualifiers as "exceptional potential," "cultural need," and "demonstrated aptitude" are difficult to define and likely are interpreted differently among Talent Search projects.[59] Moreover, strict

59. Office of Planning, Budgeting, and Evaluation, *Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the United States Office of Education*, Fiscal Year 1977, p. 273

interpretation of "exceptional potential" might result in Talent Search clients needing to meet higher standards for program participation than regular students do for entering postsecondary institutions, especially since open-door admission policies exist at many institutions. Clearly such an interpretation is not the intention of a program that has, historically, served large numbers of disadvantaged students who otherwise would not likely have considered a postsecondary education.

In addition, requirements should enumerate the age parameters of those to be served. Exactly what age parameters should be set depends on several variables, particularly whether or not Talent Search is to be targeted on youth and Educational Opportunity Centers targeted on adults--an alternative described in Section III of this report.[60]

If low-income criteria--in modified or current form--are used as the primary "umbrella" requirements for TRIO programs, Talent Search requirements can be clarified by eliminating "exceptional potential," "cultural need," and "demonstrated aptitude," and by fixing eligibility on low-income individuals with potential for a postsecondary education and a need for the program's services.[61] Again, one-third of those to be served could be exempted from meeting low-income requirements, with eligibility determined by documented need for program services.

In summary, whatever basis is used for determining eligibility, Talent Search requirements would be improved demonstrably if the only change were elimination of amorphous qualifying language.

2. *Project Services.* The authority defines sufficiently the service functions of Talent Search for the program's objectives to be understandable and the core functions identifiable. However, many program proponents, including the National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations, recommend broadening the service scope somewhat to allow projects to provide tutorial services to participants who are being encouraged to undertake or

60. The National Coordinating Council of Educational Opportunity Associations recommends targeting Talent Search on those who have either completed six years of elementary education or are at least 12 years of age, but who are not more than 27 years of age. Their recommendation is tied to targeting Talent Search more closely to serving youth and EOCs to serving adults.

61. Program regulations should likely specify further how "potential" and "need" are to be documented by projects if these qualifiers are used in any form as part of the participant eligibility requirements.

reenter postsecondary education. The argument for allowing provision of tutorial services is that such services will enhance Talent Search students' preparation for postsecondary education and their potential for success once they enter. It is difficult to argue with this contention on any basis other than the possibility that such services would overlap with similar services provided by Upward Bound projects. However, that prospect can be diminished if not eliminated by including a qualifying statement in the authority that tutorial services may be provided "if not otherwise available through a project assisted under this subpart." The inclusion of such a qualifier would make the case for allowing Talent Search to provide tutorial services compelling.

E. Educational Opportunity Centers

Many of the issues concerning Educational Opportunity Centers are explored in Section III of this report. The following discussion of additional issues and alternatives assumes that the EOC will be continued as a separate program authority.

1. *Participant Eligibility Requirements.* Unlike other TRIO programs that target services on specific individuals, Educational Opportunity Centers are to "serve areas with major concentrations of low-income populations...". Thus there is some conflict between the eligibility criteria for EOCs and the "umbrella" requirements that stipulate that the TRIO programs serve low-income youth.

While not worrisome from an operational perspective, this conflict perhaps deserves attention. One alternative not discussed previously is to eliminate "umbrella" requirements altogether, leaving it to language in each specific program authority to describe respective eligible populations. Thus, the EOC authorizing language could continue the emphasis on serving all individuals within a designated low-income community while other TRIO programs could be targeted to serve specific individuals.

If "umbrella" requirements were modified to serve low-income individuals (in contrast to youth) with the specific individuals to be served defined in respective program authorities, EOCs could remain targeted on all individuals in low-income communities as well. Conversely, if the proposed first

generation college student status and accompanying low-income criteria were applied as eligibility requirements for EOC services, qualifying language might specify the following:

- That at least two-thirds of those served must meet the first generation criteria and be from families whose taxable incomes are less than 150 percent of the Bureau of Census poverty criteria;
- That the remaining third of the clients to be served need meet only one or the other of the requirements or be certified as eligible as a result of residence in the target community;
- That all clients served must be certified as in need of academic support services in order to pursue a program beyond high school.

In addition, the language might specify age parameters for those to be served. The National Coordinating Council for Educational Opportunity Association's recommendations, for example, include language that limits participation to those "...persons who are at least 19 years of age...".

Whether or not age specification is included should be determined by whether EOCs are to be redirected to concentrate exclusively on adult learners. However, if EOCs are to be focused on adults as opposed to young people, 19 years of age may be too high. Individuals can, in most states, drop out of school at age 16. Moreover, since EOCs currently serve high school students who are 16, 17, and 18 years of age this would result in a loss of services as it is probably unrealistic to assume that new Talent Search projects would develop to serve those currently being helped by EOCs.

2. *Program Service Scope*. Unlike most TRIO programs, the EOC authority does include a basic description of the services actually to be provided by the centers. Current language, however, limits the provision of academic support services (i.e., counseling and tutorial services) to those currently enrolled in postsecondary education. EOC program directors contend that this limitation should be eliminated. They argue that large numbers of their clients are not currently enrolled in postsecondary education, are in need of academic support services--particularly tutorial services--and their chances of being enrolled and ultimately achieving success in postsecondary education would be increased if such services were available to them.

The only apparent argument against extending academic support services to all EOC participants is the potential for duplicating similar services as provided by a contiguous Upward Bound program. However, the case seems compelling for modifying the authority to allow EOCs to provide academic support

services broadly. The potential for duplication can be avoided if the authorizing language is modified as follows:

An Educational Opportunity Center may provide tutorial and counseling services and other necessary academic support services for persons participating in the program if such services are not otherwise available through a project assisted under this subpart.

F. Educational Information Centers

The Educational Information Center authority[62] provides that grants shall be made to states:

...to pay the Federal share of planning, establishing, and operating Educational Information Centers to provide educational information, guidance, counseling, and referral services for all individuals, including individuals residing in rural areas.

Among the specific services to be provided are:

1. Information and support services to seek out and encourage participation by educationally disadvantaged persons; and,
2. Information and referral services regarding: available postsecondary education and training programs, including retraining, continuing education, competency-based learning opportunities, and skill upgrading programs; job placement assistance, and remedial or tutorial services as well as guidance and counseling.

The scope of the EIC program is expansive both in the services to be provided and in its mandate to make services available within "reasonable access" of all individuals. Inasmuch as EICs are to serve all individuals, the authority appears to duplicate other federal, state, and local programs that provide similar preenrollment services to specified populations (e.g., Talent Search, Educational Opportunity Centers, veterans programs, college outreach programs, community counseling centers, etc.). In fact, the EIC authority has the unusual potential--and in a number of states has already proven--to be a focal point for the development of a coordinated statewide network of educational and career information, counseling, and referral services.

The EIC authority suggests this role, and the program regulations specify it further by requiring the EICs to coordinate services with the activities of identified organizations and agencies that "...already provide comparable information, referral and guidance services, such as occupational and career information systems."

62. Title IV, Part A, Subpart 5 of the Higher Education Act.

As a result of this and other language in the program regulations, the EIC program has come to be seen by many as a useful and necessary catalyst for statewide networks that expand and/or improve upon extant programs without duplicating their specific services. This vision accents the EICs' potential to fill service "gaps" in unserved geographic areas or in service functions where they exist.

The EIC program might promote the development of services centrally that would benefit all relevant service providers in the state, thereby promoting cost savings. Operating in this manner, the program might well develop new comprehensive banks of educational and financial aid information, making them available to service providers, such as EOC and Talent Search programs.[63] Or, in states where career information systems exist, the program might serve to assist such systems in developing and delivering educational and career information of particular importance to adult learners--a population currently without broad availability of such resources.

In other instances, the EIC might develop other informational and resource materials useful to local programs. It might provide staff development and training activities aimed at improving the ability of service-providing agencies. Additionally, the program might well make grants, funding current programs to develop new services or to extend services to new clients as part of an overall strategy to improve preenrollment services and access to postsecondary education.

This vision of statewide service networks is already becoming a reality in several states, even during the initial year of the EIC program's funding. In fact, the foregoing examples of services that might be provided are from the plans of selected states that are utilizing the EIC program as a catalyst for developing statewide service networks.

However, a number of changes in the law and regulations would enhance and clarify the role of the EICs in establishing statewide networks. Among them are:

1. Change the name of the authority to something other than "Educational Information Centers." "Educational Information" does not reflect adequately the breadth of services to be provided by the program nor the variety of

63. See Section II for further discussion of the EIC program's potential for improving information about student financial aid programs.

learning opportunities for which information and other services are to be provided. The inclusion of "centers" in the program title may well lead states to place priority on establishing new physical sites from which to deliver services, perhaps to the exclusion of using existing agencies and organizations as outlets for program services.

Perhaps a better name for the authority would be Educational and Career Services Program. This phrase more closely portrays the scope of the authority inasmuch as educational and career counseling, guidance, and referral services, in addition to information, are to be provided. It would also reduce confusion between this program and the Educational Opportunity Centers. Whether or not "Educational and Career Services" is used as a replacement, some name change should be made that better conveys the scope of services to be provided.

2. Modify the program regulations for Educational Information Centers to increase their utilization and integration of Talent Search and EOC programs. Doing so would help insure that newly-established EICs do not duplicate services already being provided by existing Talent Search and EOC programs while still allowing for widespread extension of information, referral, and counseling services to all citizens in the state. New language could include explicit requirements that:

- Talent Search and EOC project representatives be involved in framing the annual EIC state plan; and
- Existing EOCs and Talent Search projects be designated as EIC centers in their respective geographic areas, at least for those populations they are serving currently, with the projects to receive a "fair share" of any resources or support services made available to other designated sites by the state EIC program.

3. Require participating states to form a Policymaking or Advisory Committee to help establish objectives, program priorities, and methods for achieving a statewide service program. Such a requirement might be tied to the current mandate that an annual state plan be filed with the commissioner by requiring that such a committee "help establish and approve the state plan before its submission."

Such changes would strengthen the network concept of the program. Moreover, the authority or regulations could stipulate some of the service

agencies that should be included, for example:

(a) agencies and organizations providing services that are similar, in whole or in part, to those to be provided by the network, for example, Talent Search and EOC programs, community-based career and educational brokering services,[64] and statewide career information systems where they exist; (b) state and local agencies, organizations, and institutions which collect and/or manage educational, occupational, and financial aid data including but not limited to postsecondary institutions, the providers of nontraditional learning opportunities, professional school guidance associations, state scholarship agencies, state higher education planning and coordinating bodies, the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee, the State Employment Service; and (c) potential consumers of network services, including representatives of student government associations and student projects.

4. The most explicit reference to coordination currently is in the regulations which stipulate that the state plan include coordinating the activities of the center with activities of organizations and agencies providing comparable services. Thus, states are encouraged to establish separate centers but coordinate their services with other, similar agencies. To promote EIC program collaboration with existing services and avoid service duplication, the authority and/or regulations might be modified to include the following:

The EIC program should coordinate its services with organizations and agencies providing, in whole or in part, comparable information, referral, and guidance services and, to the extent feasible, develop agreements with such agencies and organizations to serve as sites for delivery of comprehensive information, guidance, and referral services as developed and/or promoted by the program.

It could go on to suggest the types of agencies with which collaboration should be promoted and agreements struck. These would include most of the direct service agencies previously suggested for Advisory Committee membership. Moreover, additional language could stipulate that:

When a career information system exists in the state, the state plan shall include assurances that the EIC will not duplicate its information services and, to the extent feasible, will include plans for utilizing the career information system as one vehicle for delivering information services.

5. Another useful modification would be to amend the Vocational Education Act and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act to make the EIC direc-

64. Noninstitutionally aligned agencies providing career, educational and/or occupational counseling, information, and referral services are increasingly being known as brokering agencies. The concept of brokering denotes neutrality in service delivery and client-centeredness in contrast to more traditional, institutionally-based counseling and information services that may be as intent on preserving the institution as they are on serving clients.

tor a statutory member of the State Occupational Information Coordinating Committee. SOICC membership is limited by those statutes and, if amended to allow the EIC director a seat, greater collaboration between the EIC and SOICC programs should follow.

With these suggested additions, the program authority would provide a mechanism for better coordinating information, counseling, and referral services that exist in a state as well as improving their scope. States would still be free to establish new service centers, but the implicit program emphasis would be on doing so only when necessary to fill service gaps. States would be encouraged to utilize EIC allocations to improve the service effectiveness of existing agencies and organizations so that a full range of preenrollment services are available more broadly to all citizens of the state.

6. Current language that defines the scope of services to be provided might be modified also to facilitate further the network concept. Language enumerating services could conclude with a statement that they should be:

within reasonable access of all individuals and, to the extent feasible, be provided in cooperation or through agreements with existing agencies and organizations providing in whole or in part, comparable information, guidance and referral services.

Additional language might suggest (or require) the development of central services that augment local efforts. For example, the state plan might be required to include:

a comprehensive strategy for the establishment, expansion or utilization of a statewide career information system to deliver occupational, educational, and financial aid information as described above and/or the provision of other information and services to network agencies and organizations, including but not limited to, telephone information services, state directories, and other published sources of information on learning opportunities.

In this context, states might be encouraged to develop statewide information banks on student financial assistance that is available from all sources to state residents. (This might take the form of a state level analogue to the proposal by Representative Biaggi for a national student aid information bank.) This might be undertaken as a separate function, though preferably as an integral part of a larger bank of education and career decision-making information.

Other important services that might be enumerated in the authority are development and training for staffs of existing service agencies and organiza-

tions. Similarly, the EIC might be called upon to assist postsecondary institutions in improving their information programs, including meeting the requirements for information as stipulated in Section 493A of the Education Amendments of 1976.

7. A larger appropriation is another key to the success of the EIC network concept. States should not be expected to establish comprehensive and coordinated services available to all citizens without sufficient resources to establish agreements with organizations, fill existing service gaps, and develop new information resources and delivery mechanisms. The FY 79 appropriation of $3 million is too small to do this. Most proponents of the EIC concept believe that a $10 million federal appropriation is more reflective of the funding needed for states to begin to implement the EIC concept and for significant results to be seen.

In sum, the EIC authority has considerable potential as a mechanism through which existing counseling, information, and referral services can be strengthened and extended broadly to all individuals who need assistance in making connections with appropriate learning opportunities.

As Cross (1978, p. 43) aptly notes:

> One of the greatest needs in a society with a rich variety of learning resources and a potential constituency of millions is to make the necessary connections between learners and resources. If that "missing link" can be supplied, the learning society can become a reality.[65]

With modification, the EIC program could provide the missing connections between learners and the vast array of today's learning resources.

---

65. K. Patricia Cross, *The Missing Link: Connecting Adult Learners to Learning Resources.* (New York, N.Y.: College Entrance Examination Board, 1978), p. 43.

Appendix. History of TRIO Funding Authorization and Appropriation Levels

Table 1. Total Program Authorization and Appropriations

Fiscal Year	Authorization	Appropriation
1965	[1]	-0-
1966	[1]	$ 2,000,000
1967	[1]	$ 2,500,000
1968	[1]	$ 4,000,000
1969	$ 10,000,000	$ 33,800,000[2]
1970	$ 56,580,000	$ 44,601,000
1971	$ 96,000,000	$ 50,000,000
1972	$ 96,000,000	$ 51,000,000[3]
1973	$100,000,000	$ 67,331,000
1974	$100,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1975	$100,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1976	$100,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1977	$200,000,000	$ 85,000,000
1978	$200,000,000	$115,000,000[4]
1979	$200,000,000	$140,000,000(est.)

Source: United States Office of Education.

1. Authorized as "such sums as may be necessary" to carry out Educational Talent Search.
2. Includes separate appropriation for Upward Bound from Office of Economic Opportunity.
3. Includes $2 million set aside for the Right To Read program.
4. Includes $2 million for a Staff Training Authority.

Table 2. History of TRIO Allocation Levels by Program

Fiscal Year	Talent Search	Upward Bound	Special Services	EOC	Total
1966	$ 2,000,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	$ 2,000,000
1967	$ 2,500,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	$ 2,500,000
1968	$ 4,000,000	-0-	-0-	-0-	$ 4,000,000
1969	$ 4,000,000	$29,924,000[1]	-0-	-0-	$ 33,800,000
1970	$ 5,000,000	$29,601,000	$10,000,000	-0-	$ 44,601,000
1971	$ 5,000,000	$30,000,000	$15,000,000	-0-	$ 50,000,000
1972	$ 5,000,000	$31,000,000	$15,000,000	-0-	$ 51,000,000
1973	$ 6,000,000	$38,331,000	$23,000,000	-0-	$ 67,331,000
1974	$ 6,000,000	$38,331,000	$23,000,000	$3,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1975	$ 6,000,000	$38,331,000	$23,000,000	$3,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1976	$ 6,000,000	$38,331,000	$23,000,000	$3,000,000	$ 70,331,000
1977	$ 8,906,780	$41,456,120	$30,037,100	$4,000,000	$ 84,400,000
1978	$12,454,602	$50,033,542	$45,265,540	$5,246,316	$113,000,000[2]
1979					$140,000,000[3]

Source: Office of Education, Office of Planning, Budgeting and Evaluation, *Annual Evaluation Report on Programs Administered by the United States Office of Education*, Fiscal Year 1977.

1. Reflects Office of Economic Opportunity appropriations for Upward Bound and $500,000 as authorized for planning and related activities by the Higher Education Act, as amended.
2. Includes $2 million for a Staff Training Authority.
3. Includes $2.4 million for a Staff Training Authority.